

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN

IN-N-OUT BURGERS,
a California corporation,

Plaintiff,

Civil Action No.
5:20-cv-11911

-vs-

Hon. Robert H. Cleland

DOLL N BURGERS LLC,
DOLL N BURGERS TECUMSEH, LLC,
DOLL N BURGERS JACKSON, LLC
VERITAS VINEYARD, LLC
and JUSTIN DALENBERG,

Magistrate Judge
Anthony P. Patti

Defendants.

DEPOSITION OF JEFFERY A. STEC, Ph.D.

taken by the Plaintiffs on the 29th day of June, 2021,
via Zoom, Chicago, Illinois, at 9:56 a.m.

APPEARANCES:

For the Plaintiffs: MR. BRIAN D. WASSOM (P60381)
MS. REGINA GILMOUR (P83117)
Warner Norcross + Judd, LLP
45000 River Ridge Drive, Suite 300
Clinton Township, MI 48038
(248) 784-5039
bwassom@wnj.com

For the Defendants: MR. BRADLEY L. SMITH (P48138)
Endurance Law Group PLC
133 West Michigan Avenue, Suite 10
Jackson, MI 49201
(517) 879-0253
bsmith@endurancelaw.com

Reported by: Angela L. Chritz, RPR, CSR-4305

Fortz Legal Support

www.FortzLegal.com

844.730.4066

FORTZ
Legal

FORTZ
Legal

1 what you're saying?

2 Q. I'm not following your response. So let me start over
3 with a different question.

4 A. Okay.

5 Q. Asking the question in a different way. Let's say I'm --
6 I'll try to make it as close to the reality as possible.
7 Let's say I am testing these treatment images of In-N-Out
8 Burger and I want to know whether or not these particular
9 images have secondary meaning in them. And as a control
10 image, I use a picture of the Golden Arches, exterior of
11 the McDonald's sign -- of the McDonald's building, has
12 the Golden Arches on it, it's got Ronald McDonald all
13 over it, everything you could possibly associate with
14 McDonald's.

15 Let's say close to 100 percent of the
16 respondents identify those images with McDonald's, and
17 thus, all of them answer one company for the control
18 images.

19 Now, in that situation, it really doesn't
20 matter what images I show of the treatment images. I get
21 a zero percent secondary meaning, but that doesn't
22 actually tell me anything about how many people have
23 secondary meaning in the In-N-Out trade dress, right?

24 A. If you're saying that part of the hypothetical is that
25 the control percentage, in other words, the percentage of

1 people/respondents that were shown that image, and I
2 believe you said it's the McDonald's images, would
3 associate it with McDonald's, one company, let's just say
4 one company, then that 100 percent would be netted
5 against whatever the percentage of people/respondents who
6 said one company from the treatment, the treatment could
7 be no more than 100 percent. So the net would be zero,
8 if not a negative number, if you were to do that type of
9 comparison.

10 Q. Okay. All right. We're on the same page then.

11 So the result of that net zero though doesn't
12 tell me any useful information about the In-N-Out trade
13 dress because I haven't actually tested the In-N-Out
14 trade dress at that point, right.

15 A. The way you've described the hypothetical, so I don't
16 know if In-N-Out would suggest that any of the McDonald's
17 trade dress and the images used in the control are part
18 of what's protected or asserted by In-N-Out, that I don't
19 know.

20 If you want to say the hypothetical -- in the
21 hypothetical that that's the case, In-N-Out wouldn't
22 assert any of its design elements against McDonald's,
23 then I can agree with you that there's no way then you
24 could test those design elements for In-N-Out by showing
25 McDonald's pieces of information.

1 Q. Okay. So then you'd agree with me that separate from
2 this question of are we changing only the things in the
3 trade dress, you also don't want to introduce noise in
4 the control images by introducing secondary meaning that
5 is unrelated to the trade dress as well, right? That
6 would artificially deflate the net secondary meaning
7 number?

8 A. So if you're asking whether you'd want to introduce in
9 the control images, design elements, whatever you want to
10 call them -- I'm sorry.

11 Q. No, keep going.

12 A. I heard feedback I thought someone else was talking.

13 Q. No.

14 A. So if you wanted to test the -- you wanted to create the
15 control and you wanted to make sure the control wouldn't
16 be associated with one source because of other design
17 elements, that would perhaps be associated with one
18 company, then you could potentially consider that in the
19 context of the control by removing those design elements.

20 So at the end of the day, to make it as
21 concrete as possible, one of the things I did in my
22 survey was to remove the palm trees, because I understand
23 that was something that was filed as a trademark by
24 In-N-Out, I believe it was a fairly long time ago, and so
25 by leaving that in the control, which doesn't appear

1 one source, but they didn't know the name of it, they're
2 still going to answer this question no, right? Or don't
3 know, one of the two?

4 A. So if they have an opinion about what company puts out
5 the products from this quick service restaurant, they
6 would presumably answer yes. So they would answer
7 Question 1 yes. And then if they answered yes, they
8 would be asked what company do you think puts out the
9 product. And type in whatever they want, or if they
10 didn't know, they would then enter that.

11 Q. Let's say they're familiar with the dress, they've seen
12 it a hundred times, name's on the tip of their tongue,
13 just can't think about it, so they have to answer
14 "don't know," but they're intimately familiar with the
15 dress. They're still going to answer "don't know"?

16 A. Well, if they're intimately familiar with the trade
17 dress, then it begs the question how they don't know the
18 name of the company. But if they -- if what you say is
19 what happens, so they're intimately aware of the trade
20 dress, but they can't think of the name of the company,
21 then presumably they would say "don't know."

22 Q. That's ultimately going to count as somebody in your
23 survey for whom they're not confused, correct?

24 A. This is going to be -- so let's, I guess, put this in the
25 proper context. First what they're going to see before

1 they get to these questions is the junior user's images
2 or stimuli. So you're paging through some of it now.

3 That stimuli is what they're going to see. So if they
4 think that's associated with somebody, but they can't
5 think of who it is, then they would say "don't know" to
6 Question 2. And because they don't know who it is, then
7 essentially they would be counted as somebody who isn't
8 confused.

9 Q. Who is not confused. You cut out at the end there. You
10 count it as what?

11 A. Somebody who was not confused.

12 Q. Now, you didn't alter the identifying information here in
13 this picture on page 34 that says "Doll N Burgers,"
14 correct?

15 A. That's correct. That was the way it appeared in the
16 original picture.

17 Q. Right.

18 And are you familiar, did you read through the
19 comments the number of people who said -- who identified
20 Doll N Burgers because they said that's what it said on
21 the building or that's what it said on the sign?

22 A. I did read the open-ended answers and I believe we
23 created a table farther down in the report that gives the
24 open-ended answers at least categorized.

25 Q. Well, as you categorized them, right?